arXiv:1607.05515v1 [math.LO] 19 Jul 2016

DETERMINACY SEPARATIONS FOR CLASS GAMES

SHERWOOD HACHTMAN

Abstract. We show, assuming weak large cardinals, that in the context of games played in a proper class of moves, clopen determinacy is strictly weaker than open determinacy. The proof amounts to an analysis of a certain level of L that exists under large cardinal assumptions weaker than an inaccessible. Our argument is sufficiently general to give a family of determinacy separation results applying in any setting where the universal class is sufficiently closed; e.g., in third, seventh, or $(\omega + 2)$th order arithmetic. We also prove bounds on the strength of Borel determinacy for proper class games. These results answer questions of Gitman and Hamkins.

§1. Introduction. One theme in the study of infinite games is their close connection to principles of transfinite recursion. At the lowest level, this is embodied in Steel's seminal result [12] that open and clopen determinacy for games on ω are both equivalent to the axiom ATR_0 of arithmetic transfinite recursion. In contrast, Schweber [11] has shown that in the third order setting, clopen determinacy for games with moves in $\mathbb{R}$ is equivalent to transfinite recursion along wellfounded relations on $\mathbb{R}$ (modulo some choice); but these principles do not imply open determinacy for games with moves in $\mathbb{R}$. Recently we presented in [5] an alternate proof of Schweber's separation result using inner models in place of forcing.

The main result of this paper is a similar determinacy separation in the context of proper class games within some second or higher order set theory, such as von Neumann-Bernays-Gödel set theory, NBG. Games of this kind were defined and investigated by Gitman and Hamkins [3]. There they proved clopen determinacy is equivalent to a transfinite recursion principle allowing the iteration of first-order definitions along proper class wellorders; they conclude with a number of open questions, including that of whether open and clopen determinacy are equivalent for games with a proper class of moves.

We show here that a translation of our analysis in [5] can be employed to prove that clopen determinacy for class games does *not* imply open determinacy for class games. Indeed, our presentation uniformly separates open and clopen determinacy, not just for games on reals or on class trees in NBG, but in many settings of typed higher order arithmetic, provided the next-to-largest type is sufficiently closed to allow coding of functions. This answers Gitman and Hamkin's question in the negative, as well as reproving our generalization of

I am grateful to Victoria Gitman for introducing me to the questions discussed here. I also thank the American Institute of Mathematics and organizers of the workshop "High and Low Forcing" held in January, 2016, which allowed these initial conversations to take place.

Schweber's separation result to n-th order arithmetic, for all $n \geq 3$ (and indeed, to $(\alpha + 2)$th order arithmetic for ordinals α).

In the paper's final section, we discuss the strength of determinacy for class games with payoff in levels of the Borel hierarchy in the setting of Morse-Kelley set theory, MK. In particular, we show (again under mild large cardinals) Borel determinacy for proper class games is not provable in MK. This is a class games analogue of H. Friedman's famous result [2] from the study of second order arithmetic.

We largely wish to avoid the formalisms of the typed set theories our results concern, and do so by focusing on a purely set-theoretic analysis of Gödel's L carried out in ZFC. The main prerequisite, then, is familiarity with constructibility and Condensation arguments; though it will be mentioned, the reader need not be familiar with Jensen's fine structure theory to understand this paper.

§2. Background and definitions.

2.1. Games on trees. Let X be a set. $X^{<\omega}$ denotes the set of finite sequences of elements of X; X^Y denotes the set of functions $f : Y \to X$; hence X^ω is the set of ω-sequences of elements of X. By *tree on* X, we mean a subset $T \subseteq X^{<\omega}$ closed under taking initial segments. A tree is *illfounded* if there exists an infinite branch through T, that is, an $x \in {}^\omega X$ such that $\langle x(0), \ldots, x(n)\rangle \in T$ for all n; otherwise T is *wellfounded*.

We regard games as being played on trees. If T is a tree on X, two players, I and II, play a game on T by alternating choosing elements of X, e.g.

I	x_0		x_2	$\ldots$	x_{2n}		
II		x_1		$\ldots$		x_{2n+1}	

subject to the rule that $\langle x_0, \ldots, x_i\rangle \in T$ at all positions of the game. The first player who disobeys this requirement (by being forced to make a move from a terminal node of T, for example) loses the game.

We understand a *strategy* to be a special kind of function, with domain a subset of T and codomain X, which instructs one of the two players how to move at all positions reachable according to the strategy at which it is that player's turn. Formally, however, we here regard strategies as subtrees of T of a special form, e.g. a strategy for Player I is a tree $S \subseteq T$ so that whenever $s \in S$ has even length, there is exactly one $x \in X$ so that $s^\frown\langle x\rangle \in S$; and if s has odd length, then $s^\frown\langle x\rangle \in S$ iff $s^\frown\langle x\rangle \in T$, for all $x \in X$. So construed, strategies in games on T may be regarded as subsets of T; in the event that X is closed under taking finite sequences, strategies in games on X are themselves subsets of X.

Clopen determinacy for games on X, denoted Δ^X_1 -DET, is the assertion that whenever T is a wellfounded tree on X, one of the players has a winning strategy in the game on T (i.e., a strategy that never instructs that player to leave T). *Open determinacy for games on* X, denoted Σ^X_1 -DET, is the assertion that for all trees T on X, either Player I (Open) has a strategy in T that contains no infinite plays (equivalently, is a wellfounded subtree of T), or Player II (Closed) has a strategy in T that avoids terminal nodes.

2.2. Models that rank their wellfounded trees. All of the separation results of this paper are witnessed in levels of Gödel's constructible universe L.

We prefer here to work with Jensen's J-hierarchy (see [7], [10]), though standard remarks about the harmlessness of ignoring the difference between J_α and L_α apply; in particular, $J_\alpha = L_\alpha$ when $\omega \cdot \alpha = \alpha$. The main fine structural feature we need is *acceptability*, namely, whenever $\rho \leq \alpha$ and there is a subset of ρ in $J_\alpha \setminus J_{\alpha+1}$, there is a surjection $h : \rho \to J_\alpha$ in $J_{\alpha+1}$. Note: We adopt the indexing of the J_α's whereby $\mathrm{ON} \cap J_\alpha = \omega \cdot \alpha$ for ordinals α.

It is a theorem of ZFC that a tree T is wellfounded if and only if there is a function $\rho : T \to \mathrm{ON}$ such that whenever $s, t \in T$ with $s \subsetneq t$, we have $\rho(s) > \rho(t)$. For any wellfounded tree, there is a unique such function which takes the minimal possible values, that is, $\rho(s) = \sup_{s \subsetneq t \in T}(\rho(t) + 1)$; we say this ρ is the *ranking function of* T, and assert the existence of a ranking function by saying T *is ranked*. We remark in passing that the existence of ranking functions for wellfounded trees is *not* provable in weak theories such as KP (though cf. Theorem 2.3 and Remark 4.2, below).

Definition 2.1. Let $\psi(v)$ be a Π_1 formula in the language of set theory with one free variable. We let θ^ψ be the least ordinal θ (if there is one) so that J_θ satisfies: "There is a largest cardinal, κ, and:

- $\psi(\kappa)$ holds;
- κ is regular and uncountable;
- Every wellfounded tree on κ is ranked."

In our main application, $\psi(\kappa)$ will express "κ is inaccessible". Wherever possible, we drop ψ from the notation for simplicity, referring simply to θ. We describe how varying ψ obtains various separation results in §4.

Note that by Condensation, θ, if it exists, is countable. Note also that since κ is the largest cardinal of J_θ, any tree in J_θ may be regarded as a tree on κ by taking its image under an appropriate bijection. Furthermore, countable closure of κ in J_θ guarantees that if $T \in J_\theta$ is an illfounded tree on κ, then there is an infinite branch through T which belongs to J_κ; thus the wellfoundedness of trees in J_θ is Σ_0 in parameters.

Lemma 2.2. *θ is closed under ordinal successor, addition, multiplication, and exponentiation. In particular, $\omega \cdot \theta = \theta$, and so $L_\theta = J_\theta$.*

Proof. Recall ([10], Lemma 1.5) that each J_α is a model of Σ_0-Comprehension; also, clearly $\kappa^{<\omega} \in J_{\kappa+1} \subseteq J_\theta$. Suppose $\kappa < \alpha < \omega \cdot \theta$. By definition of J_θ there is a bijection $h_\alpha : \kappa \to \alpha$ which belongs to J_θ. Define

$$T_\alpha := \{s \in \kappa^{<\omega} \mid s(0) = 0 \text{ and } h_\alpha \circ s(i) > h_\alpha \circ s(j) \text{ for all } 0 < i < j < |s|\}.$$

The tree T_α is clearly wellfounded, and has rank at least $\alpha+1$; hence $\alpha+1 < \omega \cdot \theta$.

For ordinal addition, if $\alpha, \beta < \omega \cdot \theta$ then defining T_α, T_β as above,

$$T_{\alpha+\beta} = \{s^\frown t \mid s \in T_\beta, t \in T_\alpha\}$$

is wellfounded with rank $\alpha + \beta$.

The remaining closure properties are proved similarly, defining trees with suitably large ranks; we leave these as an exercise. ⊣

Although L_θ possesses some fairly useful closure properties, we now show that it fails to satisfy even weak fragments of Replacement. In what follows, $\Sigma_n(X)$

formulas are Σ_n formulas with parameters from X (so $\Sigma_1(\{\kappa\})$ formulas have at most parameter κ). Recall a transitive set M is *admissible* if $(M, \in)$ is a model of Kripke-Platek set theory, KP (see [1]); levels J_α of L are admissible if and only if they satisfy Σ_1-Replacement (see [7], Lemma 2.11). Δ_1-Comprehension is a consequence of KP ([1], Theorem 4.5).

THEOREM 2.3. *L_θ is not admissible. Indeed, we have*

1. *There is a cofinal map $F : \omega \to \theta$ that is $\Sigma_1(\{\kappa\})$-definable over L_θ;*
2. *The $\Sigma_1(\{\kappa\})$-theory of L_θ is not an element of L_θ;*
3. *There is an $a \subseteq \omega$ that is $\Delta_1(\{\kappa\})$-definable over L_θ, but not in L_θ.*

PROOF. Let $F(0) = \kappa$, and inductively let $F(n+1)$ be the least α such that every wellfounded tree T on κ belonging to $J_{F(n)+1}$ has a rank function belonging to J_α. Note that this F is well-defined: Given β with $\kappa < \beta < \theta$, the set $W = \{T \in J_\beta \mid T \text{ is wellfounded}\}$ is an element of J_θ by Σ_0-Comprehension, and since W has size κ we may regard the direct sum of these,

$$\bigoplus_{T \in W} T = \{\langle T \rangle^\frown s \mid s \in T \in W\},$$

as a tree on κ; this is wellfounded, and by the definition of L_θ, must be ranked in L_θ, hence in some J_α with $\alpha < \theta$.

The map F is easily seen to be increasing, and is defined via a $\Sigma_1(\{\kappa\})$-recursion over L_θ, so is itself $\Delta_1(\{\kappa\})$-definable.

Now let $\lambda = \sup F"\omega$. Then J_λ satisfies that every wellfounded tree on κ is ranked, and so we must have $\lambda = \theta$, by the minimality condition in the definition of θ. This proves (1); since there is a Σ_1-definable cofinal map $F : \omega \to \theta$, we have that L_θ is not admissible.

Now if H is the Σ_1 Skolem hull in L_θ of $\{\kappa\}$, we have that H must contain the range of F, and in particular $\mathrm{ON} \cap H$ is unbounded in θ; and κ clearly is a regular cardinal in H, is the largest cardinal there, and $H \models \psi(\kappa)$. Since $H \cong J_\alpha$ for some $\alpha \leq \theta$ by Condensation, we must have $\alpha = \theta$ by the minimality in our definition of θ. It follows that $H = L_\theta$; that is, the Σ_1-projectum of L_θ in parameter $\{\kappa\}$ is ω. In particular, the $\Sigma_1(\{\kappa\})$ theory of L_θ does not belong to L_θ (e.g. by acceptability, if this theory did belong to L_θ, then it would belong to L_κ, and taking a transitive collapse there of the atomic diagram coded by the theory would yield the contradiction $L_\theta \in L_\kappa$). This shows (2).

(3) now follows from (1) and (2): Fix an enumeration $\langle \varphi_i(v) \rangle_{i \in \omega}$ of Σ_1 formulae with one free variable. Since F is $\Delta_1(\{\kappa\})$-definable, so is the set

$$a = \{2^i 3^n \mid J_{F(n)} \models \varphi_i(\kappa)\}.$$

The $\Sigma_1(\{\kappa\})$-theory of L_θ is $\Sigma^0_1(a)$; hence $a \notin L_\theta$, proving (3). ⊣

§3. Determinacy separations in the L_θ's. In this section, we fix a suitable Π_1 formula $\psi(u)$ and suppose $\theta = \theta^\psi$ and κ are as in Definition 2.1.

THEOREM 3.1. *L_θ is a model of Δ^κ_1-DET.*

The proof is the usual transfinite inductive construction; the point is the induction only needs to go up to the rank of the tree T, and L_θ is sufficiently closed to carry this out.

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.1. Fix a tree $T \in L_\theta$ on κ that is clopen. There is a rank function ρ for T in L_θ, so suppose $\rho(\langle\rangle) = \mu < \theta$. By induction on the rank of nodes in T, we define a map $\sigma : T \to \{0,1\}$, required to satisfy

$$\sigma(s) = 0 \iff (\exists \xi \in \kappa) s^\frown\langle\xi\rangle \in T \text{ and } \sigma(s^\frown\langle\xi\rangle) = 1.$$

So in particular, $\sigma(s) = 0$ for all terminal nodes of T, and $\sigma(s)$ is uniquely defined whenever it has been defined on all extensions of s in T; so the map σ is uniquely determined. This σ easily defines a winning strategy for the player ("Us") whose turn it is at s, whenever $\sigma(s) = 0$: Let Us play the least ξ so that $\sigma(s^\frown\langle\xi\rangle) = 1$. Then the opponent ("Them") will only be able to play to nodes assigned 0, and Us's favorable position is preserved; this continues until Us makes a move to a terminal node, at which point Them loses.

Since a winning strategy in T is Σ_0-definable from $\{T, \sigma, \kappa\}$, it will be enough to show $\sigma \in L_\theta$. Suppose $T \in J_\beta$, where $\beta < \theta$.

Let us say a partial map $\tau : T \rightharpoonup \{0,1\}$ is a *partial winning strategy* if

- $\tau(s) = 0 \to (\exists \xi < \kappa)\tau(s^\frown\langle\xi\rangle) = 1$;
- $\tau(s) = 1 \to (\forall \xi < \kappa) s^\frown\langle\xi\rangle \in T \to \tau(s^\frown\langle\xi\rangle) = 0$.

In particular, if $\tau(s) = 1$ then τ is defined at all one-step extensions of s in T.

Notice that by wellfoundedness of T, any two partial winning strategies must agree on the intersection of their domains. We argue by induction on $\alpha \leq \mu$ that there is a partial winning strategy $\sigma_\alpha \in J_{\beta+\alpha+1}$ so that $\{s \in T \mid \rho(s) < \alpha\} \subseteq \mathrm{dom}(\sigma_\alpha)$; in particular, $\sigma = \sigma_\mu \in J_{\beta+\mu+1} \subset L_\theta$ (as $\beta+\mu+1 < \theta$ by Lemma 2.2), as needed.

The claim is clear for $\sigma_0 = \emptyset$. Given σ_α, we may let $\sigma_{\alpha+1}(s)$ be defined iff for all ξ with $s^\frown\langle\xi\rangle \in T$, $\sigma_\alpha(s^\frown\langle\xi\rangle)$ is defined; and then set $\sigma_{\alpha+1}(s) = 0$ iff for some such ξ, $\sigma_\alpha(s^\frown\langle\xi\rangle) = 1$. This is clearly definable from σ_α, and inductively, takes values on all nodes s with $\rho(s) \leq \alpha$, so takes care of the successor case.

So let $\lambda \leq \mu$ be limit and suppose we have the claim for $\alpha < \lambda$. Put

$$\sigma_\lambda = \bigcup \{\tau \in J_{\beta+\lambda} \mid \tau \text{ is a partial winning strategy}\}.$$

It is easy to see that σ_λ, so defined, is a partial winning strategy, and by inductive hypothesis, takes values at all nodes s with $\rho(s) < \lambda$. It is definable over $J_{\beta+\lambda}$, so belongs to $J_{\beta+\lambda+1}$. This completes the proof. ⊣

The next theorem is the heart of the paper.

THEOREM 3.2. *L_θ is not a model of Σ^κ_1-DET.*

PROOF. Note that if L_θ satisfies the determinacy of the open game played on a tree T, then the witnessing strategy being winning is upwards absolute to V (recall $T \subseteq \kappa^{<\omega}$ is a countable tree in V): A winning strategy for Open is a tree with no infinite branches, and since L_θ ranks its wellfounded trees, such a strategy must really have no infinite branch in V; on the other hand, a winning strategy for Closed is just a strategy with no terminal nodes, and this is clearly absolute.

So it will be sufficient to exhibit a game tree T on κ—equivalently, on L_κ—which is winning for Closed in V, but for which no true winning strategy can belong to L_θ. The game we define is one in which any winning strategy for

Closed must compute the $\Sigma_1(\{\kappa\})$ theory of L_θ; by (2) of Theorem 2.3, there can be no winning strategy for Closed in L_θ.

Let us describe in outline the game and the proof that it has the desired properties. In the first round, Open chooses a natural number, i, corresponding to the index of some $\Sigma_1(\{\kappa\})$ formula, $\varphi_i(\kappa)$, in our fixed enumeration. Closed must choose a truth value $j \in \{0,1\}$ for this $\varphi_i(\kappa)$. In the remaining ω moves of the game, Closed must plays ordinals $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \ldots$ corresponding to levels J_{α_n} that in some sense resemble L_θ while agreeing with the value j played for $\varphi_i(\kappa)$; meanwhile, Open is allowed to play arbitrary sets $x_0, x_1, \ldots$ from our universe of sets L_κ, which Closed is obligated to capture by the models L_{α_k}. Closed must also ensure these levels cohere, by providing Σ_0-preserving embeddings $\pi_{i,i+1} : L_{\alpha_i} \to L_{\alpha_{i+1}}$.

Now, Closed can win the game in V, simply by always playing the correct truth value of $\varphi_i(\kappa)$ in L_θ, then by playing α_i corresponding to transitive collapses of sufficiently large hulls of initial segments of L_θ. But any true winning strategy in this game must play the correct truth values of $\varphi_i(\kappa)$: Using the countability of L_κ in V, we can, playing as Open, list *all* sets in L_κ. If Closed lasts infinitely many plays, then we may take the direct limit along the embeddings $\langle \pi_n \rangle_{n \in \omega}$; we argue that this direct limit must be isomorphic to L_θ, so that the truth value j asserted by Closed must have agreed with the real truth value of $\varphi_i(\kappa)$ in L_θ.

We proceed to the formal argument. Let the game tree T consist of finite plays of the following form:

Open	$i \in \omega$		x_0	x_1	$\ldots$
Closed		$j \in \{0,1\}, \alpha_0$	π_0, α_1	π_1, α_2	$\ldots$

$x_n, \alpha_n, \pi_n \in L_\kappa$

The Closed player must maintain the following conditions, for all $n \in \omega$:

- Each J_{α_n} satisfies: "there is a largest cardinal κ_n, which is regular, and $\psi(\kappa_n)$ holds";
- $J_{\alpha_n} \models \varphi_i(\kappa_n)$ iff $j = 0$;
- $x_n \in J_{\kappa_{n+1}}$, for all n;
- $\pi_n : J_{\alpha_n} \to J_{\alpha_{n+1}}$ is Σ_0-preserving, $\mathrm{crit}(\pi_n) = \kappa_n$, and $\pi_n(\kappa_n) = \kappa_{n+1}$;
- For any tree $S \in J_{\alpha_n}$ on κ_n, $\pi_n(S)$ is either ranked or illfounded in $J_{\alpha_{n+1}}$

(cf. Definition 2.1). The game tree T is easily seen to be definable over L_κ, so belongs to L_θ.

LEMMA 3.3. *Closed has (in V) a winning strategy for the game on T.*

PROOF OF LEMMA 3.3. We describe how Closed ought to play to win the game in T. For notational convenience, fix a sequence $\langle i, x_0, x_1, \ldots \rangle$ potentially played by Open; the replies by Closed will always depend only on the moves made so far. Let $j = 0$ iff $L_\theta \models \varphi_i(\kappa)$, and fix $\tau_0 < \theta$ sufficiently large that $J_{\tau_0} \models \varphi_i(\kappa)$ iff $j = 0$; since φ_i is Σ_1, such an ordinal exists.

Having fixed τ_0, let $\langle \tau_n \rangle_{n \in \omega}$ be an increasing sequence of ordinals cofinal in θ so that for all n, every tree on κ in L_{τ_n} that is wellfounded is ranked in $L_{\tau_{n+1}}$; note that such a sequence exists, by the same argument that the F in (1) of Theorem 2.3 is well-defined.

We now define an increasing ω-sequence of sets $H_0 \subseteq H_1 \subseteq H_2 \subseteq \cdots \subset L_\theta$, with each $H_n \in L_\theta$, by induction. Let $H_{-1} = \emptyset$, and for each $n < \omega$, let H_n satisfy

- $|H_n| < \kappa$ in L_θ,
- $H_n \prec J_{\tau_n}$,
- $H_{n-1} \cup \{x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}\} \subseteq H_n$,
- $H_n \cap \kappa \in \kappa$.

The fact that κ is regular and uncountable inside L_θ allows us to obtain each H_n in the standard way, by interleaving Skolem hulls and transitive closures below κ for ω-many steps; and then each H_n, being inductively defined from finitely elements of L_θ, is in L_θ. Note that the third point entails $H_n \cap L_\kappa = L_{\kappa_n}$ for some $\kappa_n < \kappa$.

Now for $n < \omega$, let α_n be the unique ordinal so that $J_{\alpha_n} \cong H_n$, which exists by Condensation. Furthermore, the fact that $|H_n| < \kappa$ in L_θ guarantees $\alpha_n < \kappa$; and letting $e_n : J_{\alpha_n} \to H_n \prec J_{\tau_n}$ be the anticollapse embedding, we have $\mathrm{crit}(e_n) = \kappa_n$. We then set, for $n < \omega$,

$$\pi_n = e_{n+1}^{-1} \circ e_n.$$

It is now easily verified that $\langle \alpha_n, \pi_n \rangle_{n \in \omega}$ satisfies the requirements of the game on T for Closed; Σ_0-preservation of the maps π_n is immediate from elementarity of the embeddings and the fact that for all n, J_{τ_n} and $J_{\tau_{n+1}}$, hence H_n and H_{n+1}, have the same $\Sigma_0(H_n)$-theory. ⊣

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose σ is a winning strategy for Closed in T. Then for all i, $\sigma(\langle i \rangle) = 0$ iff $L_\theta \models \varphi_i(\kappa)$.*

Proof of Lemma 3.4. Let σ be winning for Closed, and let $i \in \omega$ be arbitrary. Working in V, let $\langle x_n \rangle_{n \in \omega}$ be an enumeration of L_κ. Then σ produces the sequence $\langle \alpha_n, \pi_n \rangle_{n \in \omega}$ in response to play of $\langle i \rangle^\frown \langle x_n \rangle_{n \in \omega}$ by Open. We may compose the maps π_n to obtain a commuting system of maps $\pi_{m,n} : L_{\alpha_m} \to L_{\alpha_n}$ for $m < n$, resulting in a directed system

$$\langle L_{\alpha_n}, \pi_{n,m} \mid n < m < \omega \rangle.$$

Let (N, ε) be the direct limit obtained, and for all n let $\pi_{n,\infty} : L_{\alpha_n} \to N$ be the direct limit embedding. Note that each $\pi_{n,\infty}$ is Σ_0-preserving. As per usual, we identify the wellfounded part of the model N with its transitive collapse. Let $\kappa_\infty = \pi_0(\kappa_0)$.

Claim 3.5. $\kappa_\infty = \kappa$.

Proof of Claim 3.5. First observe that the rule stipulating $\pi_n(\kappa_n) = \kappa_{n+1}$ guarantees $\kappa_\infty = \pi_{n,\infty}(\kappa_n)$ for all n, and therefore $\mathrm{crit}(\pi_{n,\infty}) = \kappa_n$ for all n. Now, suppose $\xi < \kappa$. Then there is some n so that $x_n = \xi$, and so $\xi < \kappa_{n+1}$; since $\mathrm{crit}(\pi_{n+1}) = \mathrm{crit}(\pi_{n+1,\infty}) = \kappa_{n+1}$, we have $\pi_{n+1,\infty}(\xi) = \xi < \kappa_\infty$. So $\kappa \subseteq \kappa_\infty$.

Now suppose $\xi \, \varepsilon \, \kappa_\infty$ in N. Then by definition of direct limit, we have some n and $\bar{\xi} \in L_{\alpha_n}$ so that $\pi_{n,\infty}(\bar{\xi}) = \xi$. But then clearly $\bar{\xi} < \kappa_n = \mathrm{crit}(\pi_{n,\infty})$, so that $\bar{\xi} = \xi$, and hence $\kappa_\infty \leq \kappa$ as needed. ⊣

Let us denote the wellfounded ordinal height of N, $\mathrm{ON} \cap N$, by $\mathrm{wfo}(N)$. Note that this makes sense whether or not N is illfounded. An elementary argument using the Σ_0 definition of ordinal multiplication shows $\omega \cdot \mathrm{wfo}(N) = \mathrm{wfo}(N)$.

Claim 3.6. *$J_{\mathrm{wfo}(N)} \subseteq N$.*

Proof of Claim 3.6. Let $(\exists u)\Phi(u, v, w)$, where Φ is a Σ_0 formula, be the uniform Σ_1 definition of the graph of the function $\alpha \mapsto J_\alpha$. It is immediate from the Σ_0-preservation of the maps $\pi_{n,\infty}$ and the definition of direct limit that for all N-ordinals α, there is a unique $N_\alpha \in N$ so that $N \models (\exists u)\Phi(u, \alpha, N_\alpha)$.

We argue by induction that for $\alpha < \mathrm{wfo}(N)$ we have $N_\alpha = J_\alpha$. This is clear for successors, using the fact that $J_{\alpha+1}$ is the rudimentary closure of $J_\alpha \cup \{J_\alpha\}$, since rudimentary functions are Σ_0-definable.

For limit λ, let n be sufficiently large that there is $\bar{\lambda} \in J_{\alpha_n}$ with $\pi_{n,\infty}(\bar{\lambda}) = \lambda$. Then by Σ_0-preservation of π_n, we must have $\pi_{n,\infty}(J_{\bar{\lambda}}) = N_\lambda$, and so

$$N \models N_\lambda = \bigcup \{z \in N_\lambda \mid (\exists x \in N_\lambda)\Phi(x, \alpha, z)\}$$

Thus by inductive hypothesis, we must have $N_\lambda = \bigcup_{\alpha<\lambda} J_\alpha = J_\lambda$. ⊣

Claim 3.7. *$\theta \leq \mathrm{wfo}(N)$.*

Proof of Claim 3.7. We have already shown $\kappa \in \mathrm{wfo}(N)$. Suppose towards a contradiction that $\mathrm{wfo}(N) < \theta$. By minimality of θ, there must be a tree $S \in J_{\mathrm{wfo}(N)}$ on κ that is wellfounded, but has rank greater than $J_{\mathrm{wfo}(N)}$. By the previous claim, this S belongs to N. Let n be sufficiently large that $S = \pi_{n,\infty}(\bar{S})$ for some tree on κ_n in J_{α_n}. Then by the rules of the game tree T, there is a ranking function $\bar{\rho}$ for $\pi_n(\bar{S}) \in J_{\alpha_{n+1}}$. By Σ_0-preservation of the direct limit map, we have $S = \pi_{n,\infty}(\bar{S})$ is ranked by the map $\rho = \pi_{n+1,\infty}(\bar{\rho})$ in N. Now let $x \in S$ be a node with $\rho(s) = \mathrm{wfo}(N)$. Then $\mathrm{wfo}(N) = \rho\text{"}T_s$, which must belong to N by Σ_0 elementarity; but this contradicts the definition of $\mathrm{wfo}(N)$ as the least ordinal not in N. ⊣

Claim 3.8. *$\mathrm{wfo}(N) \leq \theta$.*

Proof of Claim 3.8. Otherwise, we would have $\theta = \pi_{n,\infty}(\bar{\theta})$ for some n and $\bar{\theta} < \alpha_n$. But then $L_\theta \subseteq N$ combined with Σ_0-elementarity implies $L_{\bar{\theta}}$ satisfies the defining properties of L_θ, i.e. $L_{\bar{\theta}} \models$ "κ_n is the largest cardinal, is uncountable, $\psi(\kappa_n)$ holds, and all wellfounded trees on κ_n are ranked". But $\bar{\theta} < \theta$, contradicting minimality. ⊣

The only remaining possibility is $\mathrm{wfo}(N) = \theta$.

Claim 3.9. *N is wellfounded.*

Proof of Claim 3.9. Suppose towards a contradiction that N is illfounded. By the previous two claims, $\mathrm{wfo}(N) = \theta$. Fix a nonstandard ordinal $b \in N$. Working in $(L_b)^N$, consider the map $F : \omega \to \theta$ defined in the proof of Theorem 2.3. Recall F was cofinal in θ and $\Delta_1(\{\kappa\})$-definable over L_θ; moreover, since $(L_b)^N$ is an end-extension of L_θ, this map is computed correctly in $(L_b)^N$, and so $F \in (L_{b+1})^N$. But then $\theta = \sup F\text{"}\omega \in N$, a contradiction. ⊣

So N is wellfounded. But it is easy to argue that N is a model of $(\forall x)(\exists\beta)x \in J_\beta$, from which we conclude that $N = L_\theta$ by the proof of Claim 3.6. Now notice that since J_θ is obtained as the direct limit of the J_{α_n} under Σ_0-preserving embeddings, and since all of the J_{α_n} agree as to the truth value of the Σ_1 statements $\varphi_i(\kappa_n)$, we have that $j = 0$ iff $N = J_\theta \models \varphi_i(\kappa)$. $\dashv$

This completes the proof of Lemma 3.4, and by the remarks preceding, we have proved Theorem 3.2. $\dashv$

§4. Separation results in typed theories. The previous section proved separation results in the context of weak fragments of set theory with a largest cardinal κ. We now carry these over to the setting of set theories with proper classes.

We regard these theories as formulated in a language with two typed variables. For background on von Neumann-Bernays-Gödel set theory (NBG), the reader may consult Mendelson's text [9]; Jech's book [6] has a listing of the axioms. Our models of NBG will have the form $(V, \in, \mathcal{C})$, so that V is the universe of sets and $\mathcal{C}$ is the collection of subclasses of V. The theory of games on proper class-sized trees is developed in NBG in the natural way; see [3] for details.

THEOREM 4.1. *Assume there is a wellfounded model of* $\mathsf{ZF}^- +$ "$(\exists\kappa)\kappa$ *is inaccessible". Then there is a model of* NBG *in which clopen determinacy for proper class games holds, while open determinacy for class games fails.*

Obviously there are weaker assumptions which suffice, but this is at least a natural one.

PROOF. Let ψ be the formula

$$(\forall\alpha < \kappa)(\exists\mu < \kappa)\alpha < \mu \wedge L_\kappa \models \mu \text{ is a cardinal.}$$

This is a Π_1 formula in parameter κ, and clearly if $M \models \mathsf{ZF}^- +$ "λ is inaccessible", we have $M \models \psi(\lambda)$. Condensation arguments imply that θ^ψ (Definition 2.1) exists; as before, let κ be the largest cardinal of $L_\theta = L_{\theta^\psi}$. Since L_{θ^ψ} contains no bounded subsets of κ not in L_κ, we have that κ is inaccessible in L_θ.

We have an obvious way of regarding L_θ as a model of NBG. Namely, let $\mathcal{C}_\theta = \mathcal{P}(L_\kappa) \cap L_\theta$, and put $M_\theta = (L_\kappa, \in, \mathcal{C}_\theta)$. The proper classes of M_θ are precisely the elements of $\mathcal{C}_\theta \setminus L_\kappa$. Closure of L_θ under Σ_0-Comprehension in parameters ensures that M_θ satisfies the Class Comprehension schema (since quantification over sets in M_θ is equivalent to bounded quantification by L_κ). Note also that any two proper classes of M_θ are in bijection, and M_θ satisfies the existence of a universal choice function.

Combining Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, we are done. $\dashv$

REMARK 4.2. Working in appropriate strengthenings of NBG, one can develop a theory of L for proper class wellorders of order-type larger than ON, thus obtaining what Gitman and Hamkins call a "meta-L structure" L_Θ, where Θ is the supremum of the order-types of proper class well-orders of ON. These authors ask [3] whether clopen determinacy for class games in NBG is enough to prove admissibility of this meta-L structure.

We see the answer is no: While the M_θ of Theorem 4.1 satisfies clopen determinacy for class games, its meta-L is precisely L_θ, which is inadmissible. However,

we prove in forthcoming work that clopen determinacy for class games implies the existence of admissible models of "there is an inaccessible cardinal", so that consistency strength-wise, the determinacy assumption is the stronger theory.

Taking $\psi(u)$ to be the formula "all sets in L_u are countable in L_u", we similarly obtain the main result of Schweber's [11] (see that paper for background on the weak base theory RCA_0^3 for third order arithmetic):

THEOREM 4.3. *$(\omega, \mathbb{R}\cap L_\theta, \omega^{\mathbb{R}\cap L_\theta}\cap L_\theta)$ is a model of RCA_0^3 satisfying $\Delta_1^{\mathbb{R}}$-DET, but not $\Sigma_1^{\mathbb{R}}$-DET.*

Various other results may be formulated for languages with at least two "top types" beyond 0, e.g. by letting ψ have the intended meaning "$\kappa = \omega_5$" (7 types) or "$\kappa = \omega_{\omega+1}$" ($\omega + 2$ types), to give those examples mentioned in the abstract. We just point out that the structures L_{θ^ψ} always satisfy Σ_0-Comprehension, and so satisfy full Comprehension for formulas whose quantifiers range over objects of all but the largest type; thus these structures ought to convert to models of any reasonable base theory in higher order arithmetic.

§5. On Borel class determinacy in Morse-Kelley set theory. Throughout this section, we let the stratified Borel hierarchy $\langle\Sigma^0_\alpha\rangle_{\alpha<\omega_1}$ of subsets of X^ω, for various sets X, be defined in the natural way, by letting Σ^0_1 be the class of complements of sets of the form $[T]$ in X^ω for trees T on X, and iterating under countable union and complement.

We answer one further question of Gitman and Hamkins [3], as to whether Borel determinacy for proper class games is provable in the stronger set theory Morse-Kelley, or MK (about which see e.g. [9]). As one might expect, the answer is no: We demonstrate the existence of a proper class game with a Σ^0_4 winning condition which is not provably determined in MK, in close analogy with H. Friedman's important result [2] in the context of second order arithmetic.

Thankfully we need not delve into a proof of Friedman's theorem here, and may take the following strengthening due to Martin [8] as a black box (we present a complete proof of the lightface case in [4], pp. 18-19). Here ZF^- is ZF with the Axiom of Power Set dropped.

THEOREM 5.1 (Friedman, Martin). *Let z be a real, and suppose β is minimal so that $L_\beta[z]$ is a model of $\mathsf{ZF}^- + V{=}L[z]$; then there is a $\Sigma^0_4(z)$ game for which no winning strategy belongs to $L_\beta[z]$.*

THEOREM 5.2. *Suppose there is a transitive set model of $\mathsf{ZF}^- + (\exists\kappa)$"$\kappa$ is inaccessible". Then there is a sequence of class trees, $\langle T_{i,j,k}\rangle_{i,j,k\in\omega}$, definable by a quantifier-free formula with no parameters, so that $\bigcup_{i\in\omega}\bigcap_{j\in\omega}\bigcup_{k\in\omega}[T_{i,j,k}]$ is the payoff class of a game whose determinacy cannot be proved in MK.*

PROOF. Let κ be the least so that some $\beta > \kappa$ exists such that $L_\beta \models \mathsf{ZF}^- +$ "κ is inaccessible." As before, the theorem is proved by reinterpreting this set model as a two-sorted model $M = (L_\kappa, \in, \mathcal{P}(L_\kappa)\cap L_\beta)$. Note that this time, we have that the full Class Comprehension schema (allowing formulae with class quantifiers) holds in M, because L_β is a model of the stronger theory ZF^-.

The result is more or less immediate from the following:

THEOREM 5.3 (Martin). *Let $\beta > \kappa$ be the least ordinal above κ so that $L_\beta \models \mathsf{ZF}^-$. Then there is a Σ^0_4 game on $\kappa^{<\omega}$ which has no winning strategy in L_β.*

This is Exercise 1.4.5 in Martin's unpublished determinacy manuscript [8]. For the reader's convenience, we offer our solution.

PROOF OF THEOREM 5.3. Regard conditions in the collapse poset $\mathrm{Coll}(\omega, \alpha)$ as finite sequences $p : n \to \alpha$. For G $\mathrm{Coll}(\omega, \alpha)$-generic, we let z_G denote the collapse real coded by G; more generally, any $h : \omega \to \mathrm{ON}$ induces a prewellorder z_h of $|p| \in \omega$.

For the rest of the proof, fix G $\mathrm{Coll}(\omega, \kappa)$-generic over L_β. Then $L_\beta[G]$ is the minimal transitive model of ZF^- containing the real z_G. By Theorem 5.1, $\Sigma^0_4(z_G)$ determinacy fails in $L_\beta[G]$. So let

$$A_G := \{x \in \omega^\omega \mid \exists i \forall j \exists k \forall n \varphi(i, j, k, x{\restriction}n, z_G{\restriction}n)\},$$

where φ is a recursive condition, be a $\Sigma^0_4(z_G)$ set witnessing this failure.

Working in L_β, define a game on $\kappa^{<\omega} \times \omega$ (easily converted to one on κ via tuple coding) as follows: Moves in the game are pairs $\langle p, x\rangle$ where $p \in \mathrm{Coll}(\omega, \kappa)$ and $x \in \omega$. The players must maintain $p_{n+1} \lneq p_n$ for all i. Player I wins if the infinite play $\langle h, x\rangle := \langle \bigcup_n p_n, \langle x_n\rangle_{n\in\omega}\rangle$ satisfies

$$\exists i \forall j \exists k \forall n \varphi(i, j, k, x{\restriction}n, z_h{\restriction}n).$$

This clearly defines a Σ^0_4 subset of κ^ω.

We claim there is no winning strategy in this game in L_β. Suppose without loss of generality that σ is a winning strategy for Player I. We will obtain a contradiction by converting this winning strategy to one in $L_\beta[G] = L_\beta[z_G]$ that wins the game on ω with payoff A_G.

CLAIM 5.4. *Suppose $s = \langle p_0, x_0, \ldots p_n, x_n\rangle$ is a position reachable by σ where Player I has moved last, and $k \in \omega$; then the set*

$$D_{\langle s,x\rangle} = \{q \mid (\exists p)\sigma(\langle p_0, x_0, \ldots, p_n, x_n, p, x_{n+1}\rangle) = \langle q, l\rangle \text{ for some } l \in \omega\}$$

is dense in $\mathrm{Coll}(\omega, \kappa)$ *below* p_n.

PROOF. This is immediate: any pair $\langle p, k\rangle$ with $p \lneq p_n$ constitutes a legal move for Player II, and σ must reply with $q \leq p$. ⊣

Now in $L_\beta[G]$, it is now easy to describe a strategy for Player I to win the game with payoff A_G: copy the moves in the game on ω to one in the game on $\kappa^{<\omega} \times \omega$, and use Claim 5.4 to attribute moves p_{2n+1} to Player II.

In more detail, assume inductively that we have reached a position $\langle x_0, \ldots, x_{2n}\rangle$ in the game on ω, so that some position $s = \langle x_i, p_i\rangle_{i<2n+1}$ in the larger game is according to σ, and $p_{2n} \in G$. We respond to Player II's next move x_{2n+1} using the Claim to find $p_{2n+1} \in D_{\langle s,x_{2n+1}\rangle} \cap G$; then σ makes a reply p_{2n+2}, x_{2n+2} with $p_{2n+2} \in G$, and the construction continues.

Thus any play $x \in \omega^\omega$ according to the strategy we have described may be copied to a play $\langle G, x\rangle$ compatible with σ. Since σ is a winning strategy for Player I, we must have $x \in A_G$. But the strategy we have described is clearly definable in $L_\beta[G]$, which completes the contradiction. ⊣

We finish by defining S to be the class of sequences of pairs recording, in an increasing fashion, a potential result of a partial play in the game from the previous proof (recall $\kappa = \mathrm{ON}^M$), and setting

$$T_{i,j,k} = \{s \in S \mid (\forall n < |s|)\varphi(i, j, k, s_n(0), s_n(1))\}.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 5.2. ⊣

Thus Borel class games need not be determined in MK. We can say a bit more: Friedman's level-by-level analysis of the strength of Borel determinacy beyond Σ^0_4 likewise may be applied to the setting of proper class games, by starting with a model with an inaccessible κ in which $V_{\kappa+\alpha}$ exists and collapsing κ to be countable. We have:

THEOREM 5.5. *Work in* ZFC*, and assume there is an inaccessible cardinal. Let* $\alpha < \omega_1$*. Then there is a transitive model* M *of* $ZF^- +$ *"There is an inaccessible cardinal* κ *such that* $V_{\kappa+\alpha}$ *exists, and* $\Sigma^0_{1+\alpha+3}$ *determinacy for games on* κ *fails."*

Regarding $(V^M_\kappa, \in, \mathcal{P}(V^M_\kappa) \cap M)$ as an MK-model, we obtain the expected hierarchy of strength:

THEOREM 5.6. *Over* MK*,* Σ^0_α *determinacy for class games does not imply* Σ^0_β *determinacy for class games, whenever* $\alpha < \beta$*.*

Sharper results are possible. In the case of $\Sigma^0_{1+\alpha+3}$ games on ω, the author has obtained equivalences between determinacy principles and the existence of countable wellfounded models of fragments of set theory; this was the setting in which the relevance of the models L_θ was first made apparent. For example,

THEOREM 5.7 ([4]). *In* Π^1_1-CA_0*,* Σ^0_4 *determinacy (for games on* ω*) is equivalent to the existence of a* θ *so that* $L_\theta \models$ "ω_1 *exists, and all wellfounded trees on* ω_1 *are ranked."*

The results of this section suggest that these proofs may be uniformly translatable from the setting of second order arithmetic to that of Morse-Kelley set theory; once the theory of "meta-L" has been developed for proper class wellorders of ordertype $\Gamma > \mathrm{ON}$ so that L_Γ makes sense, it is only necessary to check that the arguments in the style of Friedman and Martin in [4] go through. We believe the following (appropriately formalized) is provable in MK:

CONJECTURE 5.8. The determinacy of all Borel proper class games is equivalent to the existence, for each class A and countable ordinal α, of a class coding a model $L_\Theta[A] \models \mathsf{ZF}^- +$ "$V_{\mathrm{ON}+\alpha}$ exists."

REFERENCES

[1] JON BARWISE, ***Admissible sets and structures***, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1975, An approach to definability theory, Perspectives in Mathematical Logic.

[2] HARVEY M. FRIEDMAN, *Higher set theory and mathematical practice*, ***Ann. Math. Logic***, vol. 2 (1970/1971), no. 3, pp. 325–357.

[3] VICTORIA GITMAN and JOEL DAVID HAMKINS, *Open determinacy for class games*, ***Foundations of mathematics, logic at harvard, essays in honor of hugh woodin's 60th birthday***, American Mathematical Society, 2016, to appear.

[4] Sherwood Hachtman, *Calibrating determinacy strength in levels of the borel hierarchy*, (2014), submitted. Available online at `http://math.uic.edu/~shac/Calibrating.pdf`.

[5] ———, *Determinacy in third order arithmetic*, (2014), submitted. Available online at `http://math.uic.edu/~shac/reverse.pdf`.

[6] Thomas Jech, ***Set theory***, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003, The third millennium edition, revised and expanded.

[7] R. Björn Jensen, *The fine structure of the constructible hierarchy*, ***Ann. Math. Logic***, vol. 4 (1972), pp. 229–308; erratum, ibid. 4 (1972), 443, With a section by Jack Silver.

[8] Donald A. Martin, ***Determinacy***, Unpublished Manuscript, ∞.

[9] Elliott Mendelson, ***Introduction to mathematical logic***, sixth ed., Textbooks in Mathematics, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2015.

[10] Ralf Schindler and Martin Zeman, *Fine structure*, ***Handbook of set theory. Vols. 1, 2, 3***, Springer, Dordrecht, 2010, pp. 605–656.

[11] Noah Schweber, *Transfinite recursion in higher reverse mathematics*, ***J. Symb. Log.***, vol. 80 (2015), no. 3, pp. 940–969.

[12] John Robert Steel, ***Determinateness and subsystems of analysis***, ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 1977, Thesis (Ph.D.)–University of California, Berkeley.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, STATISTICS, AND COMPUTER SCIENCE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO
CHICAGO, IL 60613, USA
E-mail: hachtma1@uic.edu